

### **REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the FINAL Office Action mailed August 31, 2005.

Claims 1-42 were initially presented as filed. After a restriction requirement, Claims 19-33 were withdrawn and Claims 1-18 and 34-42 are currently pending.

Applicant files this Amendment concurrently with the present RCE. The RCE is filed to supply the Examiner with the non-US patent references that were submitted with several earlier IDS in the present application; but, apparently were not received by the Examiner. Applicant therefore submits courtesy copies of all of the IDS previously submitted – as well as copies of the non-US patent references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner considers these references and return to Applicant the initialed IDS forms in the next Office Action.

An Examiner's Interview was requested in the present application and was conducted via telephone on September 15, 2005. In attendance were Examiner Caschera, Stuart Kaler (attorney of record) and Candice Hellen Brown Elliott (inventor).

Applicant would like to take this opportunity to thank the Examiner for allowing Applicant to present arguments for the allowance of the pending Claims over the prior art of record in the case. The following constitutes Applicant's summary of the Examiner Interview. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending Claims are respectfully requested.

**Applicant's Summary of Examiner Interview**

The interview discussion focused on the language of Claim 1 and the present rejection to Claim in view of Weldy.

Applicant discussed with the Examiner several claim limitations of Claim 1 that Applicant believes is not taught, disclosed or suggested by Weldy.

For a first example of unmet claim limitations, Applicant noted that the preamble to Claim 1 sets forth a method for "converting" source data from "a first format" to "a second [display] format".

As was discussed in the interview (and which was advanced in Applicant's Amendment dated July 7, 2005), Weldy addresses a completely different problem area – i.e. one of reducing noise introduced from scanning film with CFA structures to the same format to be rendered upon a display. In reducing noise, Weldy does not convert image data from one display format to a second and different display format.

As such, the methods of Weldy would fail to produce a same function or result as claimed in Claim 1 of the present application.

As a second example of unmet claim limitations, Applicant noted that Claim 1 requires determining resample areas for each emitter in the display [of the second

format]. Once done, Claim 1 further requires the formation of fractions based upon the geometric considerations of the sample and resample areas thus determined.

Applicant noted that Weldy does not in fact determine resample areas as such and that the fractions (weighting values) formed by Weldy are not formed by the geometric considerations of the sample and resample areas – but, in fact, are dependent upon the input image data scanned. Weldy performs this different weighting function – once again – not to convert image data from a first display format to a second display format; but to reduce the introduction of noise from unevenly produced photographic film.

After some brief discussion, the Examiner vowed to take these arguments under consideration and urged Applicant to submit these summary remarks upon the telephone interview.

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration all of the pending Claims in the application. As the same remarks above for Claim 1 have the same force as to the other pending independent Claims, Applicant respectfully avers that all pending Claims are allowable over Weldy and the other art relied upon by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims are patentable over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection and pass this application to allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Stuart P. Kaler at (707) 824-2487.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 19 Sept 2005

By: Stuart P. Kaler  
Stuart P. Kaler  
Reg. No. 35, 913